UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,956	04/19/2001	Wendy Peikes	CSCO71241	1694

7590   05/18/2005

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER
HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/838,956	PEIKES, WENDY
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 4/21/05.

2.   Claims 1 – 19 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 11, 15 are independent.

3.   The rejection of claims 1 –19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable has

been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

4.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/21/05

has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dooley (US005893916A) and further in view of Husain et al. (Red Hat Linux) and

Guheen et al. (US006721713B1).

7.   **Regarding independent claim 1**, Dooley teaches that *the present invention*

generally operates by converting a UNIX man page, including text tags, to a formatted

help topic file including corresponding formatting codes that are readable by the

Windows help compiler. The help topic file (in Rich Text Format or RTF) may also be

readable by another compiler such as Bristol Technology's HyperHelp compiler for

UNIX which also accepts a similar format (Column 3, lines 29 – 35) and that *after help*

topics have been built from the man files, one or more specialized macros are optionally

executed to handle product-specific situations. In particular, a number of man page

variations exist, each of which may require one or more specialized macros to handle

unique formatting (Column 5, lines 49 – 54), which provide for **b) extracting a**

documentation requirement from said syntactic structure; c) extracting

documentation options from said syntactic structure; and d) combining said

documentation requirement and said documentation options into a

documentation tag construct (*corresponding formatting codes*). Dooley teaches that

the preferred embodiment of the invention is implemented in one or more Word Basic

macros which execute in a specifically developed Microsoft Word for Windows template

file (Column 3, lines 36 - 39), which provide for **e) automatically generating a**

standard template for a documentation content file.... Dooley does not explicitly

teach **a) examining a command definition file for a syntactic structure of a**

corresponding command. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to do so in using the invention

of Dooley because examining the **command definition file** or *UNIX man page* for its

syntactic structure would aide in more efficiently converting the *UNIX man page* into *a*

formatted help topic file. Further, Husain et al. illustrate on page 90 and teach that *you*

might have noticed that commands seem to be followed by numbers in brackets, usually (1). This refers to manual section (p 91, note box), which provide that **said command definition file comprises a linkpoint** (*manual section*)**, a keyword** (*name*)**, and an argument** (*options*) and that **said document content file comprises a natural language explanation of said keyword** (*name*) **and said argument** (*options*). It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art to combine the invention of Dooley with the teachings of Husain et al. because such a combination would provide the users of Dooley the benefit of a user-friendly extension of UNIX, i.e. Red Hat Linux. Guheen et al. teach that *relevant control information, such as security and administrative information, derived, at least in part, from the parent (source) object's control information, will normally be automatically inserted into a new WAF content container object containing extracted WAF content. This process typically occurs under the control framework of a parent object and/or WAF installation control information executing at the user's WAF installation secure subsystem* (Column 278, lines 32 – 40), that *allow a user to securely edit at least a portion of said content while maintaining said content in a secure form within said WAF content container* (Column 279, lines 1 – 3), and that *the content management and publishing services component also includes localization and translation capabilities* (Column 219, lines 43 & 44), which provide that **e) wherein said document content file provides a standard framework with automatically generated content and wherein said automatically generated content is end-user over-writable with one or more of documentation content and data of relevance and localized to said end-user**. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dooley

and Husain et al. with the invention of Guheen et al. because such a combination would

provide the users of Dooley and Husian et al. with *an invention that can be used to*

convey information regarding components of the current network framework (Column 2,

lines 13 – 15).

8.   **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Dooley does not explicitly teach that **said**

command comprises a first command of a plurality of commands ... However,

Husain et al. illustrate on page 90 that **said command comprises a first command**

(*name*) **of a plurality of commands** (*see also*) **and wherein said document content**

file further comprises a natural language explanation of one or more of: a default

value relating to said command; a usage (*synopsis*) **relating to said command; a**

second command of said plurality of commands wherein said second command

is related to said first command; and an example relating to said usage.

9.   **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Dooley teaches that *the present invention*

generally operates by converting a UNIX man page, including text tags, to a formatted

help topic file including corresponding formatting codes that are readable by the

Windows help compiler. The help topic file (in Rich Text Format or RTF) may also be

readable by another compiler such as Bristol Technology's HyperHelp compiler for

UNIX which also accepts a similar format (Column 3, lines 29 – 35), which provide for **e)**

copying said command definition file (*UNIX man page*) **into a second command**

definition file (*help topic file*)**; and f) embedding said documentation tag construct**

(*text tags/corresponding formatting codes*) **into said second command definition file**

wherein said documentation tag construct comprises a plurality of

documentation tags. Neither Dooley nor Husain et al. explicitly teach wherein one of

said documentation tags of said plurality relates to: said keyword; a string

relating to said argument; an interface relating to said argument; and a number

range relating to said argument. However, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to use and/or modify

the invention of Dooley and the teachings of Husain et al. to provide for one of said

documentation tags of said plurality relates to: said keyword (*smcdiff*); a string

relating to said argument (*smcfile1* or *smcfile2*); an interface relating to said

argument (*smc:0600*); and a number range relating to said argument (*changed

value*), since the results are illustrated in Fig 7 and derived from the document

represented by Fig 6 as disclosed in Dooley (Column 2, lines 15 – 20).

10.   **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Dooley illustrates in Figure 7 that **one or more

of said documentation tags of said plurality relates to: a documentation collection**

(*see also*) **relating to said purpose; a default** ([first] *description*) **relating to said

command; a history** ([second] *description*) **relating to said command; and an

example** (*synopsis*) **of said usage, wherein values respectively relating to said

default, said history, and said example are accessed from said documentation

content file** (Figure 6).

11.   **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Dooley teaches that *in addition, after all of the

jumps have been created, additional formatting may be performed, e.g., removing other

extraneous spaces, commas, and unmatched parenthesis as required* (Column 7, lines

13 - 16), which provide for **g3) removing embedded commas,** that *the character at the beginning of each "See also" style paragraph is removed and replaced with a comma and space for consistency purposes* (Column 5, lines 20 – 22), which provide for **g4) replacing embedded blanks with separator characters;** that *all of the manual page breaks are removed from the working document, and then manual page breaks are inserted at the beginning of each "Heading 1" style paragraph to thereby separate each help topic. In addition, in block 158, all of the text after the first word in each context string footnote is deleted. This results in a context string for each help topic that is essentially the name of the command or function which is the subject of the help topic* (Column 5, lines 5 – 13), which provide for **g5) selectively reordering names of said syntactic structure, g6) removing definite and indefinite articles to form a first product; and** that *a Add Parenthesis macro which is used to add parenthesis around "group" designations that may follow each man page function name. For example, for the aforementioned TOP END product, each man page function is grouped into one of five groups (1T, 2T, 3T, 4T and 5T). The Add Parenthesis macro basically searches each footnote and "Heading 1" style paragraph for one of the groups, and inserts parenthesis around any found group designations* (Column 5, lines 55 – 63), which provide for **g7) surrounding said first product by diacritical markers to form a final product**. Dooley does not explicitly teach **fitable values**. However, Dooley does teach that *the browse sequence footnote is left blank, and at a later date, suitable browse sequence values may be input manually by an operator, or automatically through a separate macro configured to perform this particular function* (Column 5, lines 1 – 4). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to use the invention of Dooley and provide for **g1) examining available fields for fitable values, g2) choosing a best fit value from among said fitable values**, since the skilled artisan would want the users of the invention to have the most accurate information thus insuring that the suitable browse sequence value that will automatically be input by a macro implements an algorithm that will discern the best fit value for the footnote and to accomplish it by use of some lookup table, which is one of the easiest and seamless ways known to those in the art.

12.   **Regarding dependent claim 6**, neither Dooley nor Husain et al. explicitly teach **HTML**. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to use and/or modify the invention of Dooley and the teachings of Husain et al. to provide for **converting said documentation content to Hyper Text Markup Language**, since Dooley does teach that *the present invention discloses a method, apparatus, and program storage device for converting text-based man pages to formatted help topic files of the type including non-textual formatting codes. By automating this process, porting of applications is facilitated due to the decreased effort required to port the applications' associated on-line help documents* (Column 1, lines 56 – 62), and The Free Online Dictionary of Computing defines the *hlp files* (Column 3, line 15) discussed in Dooley as *a Microsoft Windows filename extension for hypertext WinHelp files* (<http://foldoc.doc.ic.ac.uk>).

13.   **Regarding independent claim 7**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

14.   **Regarding dependent claim 8**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

15.   **Regarding dependent claim 9**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

16.   **Regarding dependent claim 10**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 5, and is rejected along the same rationale.

17.   **Regarding independent claim 11**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

18.   **Regarding dependent claim 12**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

19.   **Regarding dependent claim 13**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

20.   **Regarding dependent claim 14**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 5, and is rejected along the same rationale.

21.   **Regarding independent claim 15**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

22.   **Regarding dependent claim 16**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

23.   **Regarding dependent claim 17**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

24.   **Regarding dependent claim 18**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 5, and is rejected along the same rationale.

25.   **Regarding dependent claim 19**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

26.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 19 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

27.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/21/05 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

28.   In response to Applicant's arguments that the reference(s) teach away from the

claimed invention (p 15), it should be noted that the argument(s) are mere allegations

and do not specifically point out how the cited references teach away from the claimed

invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

NH